

## BEHRING SEA.

Award of the Arbitrator Handed Down.

## THE SEALS TO BE PROTECTED.

Outside the Decision Given in Favor of Great Britain—America Not Allowed Exclusive Rights.

PARIS, Aug. 16.—The decision of the Behring sea tribunal of arbitration was handed down at 11 o'clock yesterday morning. The five points of article 6 are decided against the United States. The close season is established to 15 miles from the coast of Alaska. The close season is to be observed both in the North Pacific ocean and in Behring sea.

A protected zone is established extending for sixty miles around the islands.

Pelagic sealing is allowed outside the zone in Behring sea from August 1.

The use of firearms in sealing is prohibited.

Baron de Courcel, after the decision was rendered, thanked the arbitrator for the close and intelligent attention they had brought to bear upon the case and Lord Hannam, a senator Morgan, in reply acknowledged his courtesy and hospitality.

After a preamble stating the case submitted, the court took up article 6 and decided as follows:

By the close of 1893 Russia claimed jurisdiction in the sea now known as Behring sea, to the extent of 100 Italian miles from the coast of Alaska, belonging to her, but in the course of the negotiations, which led to the conclusion of the treaty of 1825 with Great Britain, Russia renounced her claim.

On the fourth point we decide that the United States have no right to the seal fisheries in the Behring sea.

On the fifth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

As to the second of the five points, we, the majority, decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the third point we decide that the United States have no right to the seal fisheries in the Behring sea.

On the fourth point we decide that the United States have no right to the seal fisheries in the Behring sea.

On the fifth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the sixth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the seventh point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the eighth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the ninth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the tenth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the eleventh point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twelfth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the thirteenth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the fourteenth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the fifteenth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the sixteenth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the seventeenth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the eighteenth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the nineteenth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twentieth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twenty-first point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twenty-second point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twenty-third point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twenty-fourth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twenty-fifth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twenty-sixth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twenty-seventh point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

On the twenty-eighth point we decide and determine that Great Britain did not recognize Russia's claim to the seal fisheries in Behring sea outside the ordinary limits of territorial waters.

## SILVER AND ANTI-SILVER.

Small Show of a Compromise Among Senators.

## CONGRESSIONAL.

The Extra Session at Work—Debate on the Silver Question.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 16.—The committee on finance of the senate held a meeting today for the purpose of discussing the silver question. The committee was composed of Messrs. Sherman, Jones, and Jones.

The discussion tended to show that the finance committee was as far removed as ever from common ground on the question of general legislation on the financial situation and the repeal of the purchasing clause of the Sherman law in particular.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

The committee was divided on the question of the Sherman law, with the majority in favor of its repeal and the minority in favor of its retention.

## CONGRESSIONAL.

The Extra Session at Work—Debate on the Silver Question.

## OKLAHOMA STATEHOOD.

Convention Held at El Reno Favorable to Forming a State.

The statehood convention held at El Reno for the purpose of taking action in regard to being admitted as a state was attended by some of the best men of the territory. The convention was held at El Reno, Okla., on Tuesday, August 15th.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

The delegates from the east of the territory favored a single state composed of the Indian and Oklahoma territories, and those from the west favored two states, claiming that by including the five civilized tribes great deal of land would be saved.

## OKLAHOMA STATEHOOD.

Convention Held at El Reno Favorable to Forming a State.

## SENATOR VEST TALKS.

Minister's Statement Addresses the Senate in Favor of Bimetallism.

WASHINGTON, Aug. 16.—The senate yesterday afternoon heard a statement by Senator Vest in support of bimetallism. The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

The senator, who is a strong advocate of the gold standard, spoke for an hour and a half.

## SOME SANITARY ASPECTS OF BREAD MAKING.

BY CYRUS EDWARDS, M. D., Health Commissioner, New York City.

It is necessary, if one would understand the sanitary aspects of bread making, to fully comprehend the present theory held by scientists of germs and the part played by them in disease. The theory of disease germs is merely the name given to the knowledge had of germs by medical men. The germ theory is the result of the long process of raising and kneading so no bread save that raised with yeast has so good a chance of gathering germs.

What a moment "raising" bread is worth a few words. The introduction of the yeast into the moist dough, the addition of heat when the pan is placed near the fire produces an enormous growth of the yeast fungi—the "germs" in other words. These fungi effect a destructive fermentation of a portion of the starchy matter of the flour—one of the most valuable nutrient elements in the flour. The fermentation produces carbonic acid gas, and this, having its origin in every little particle of the starch, pushes aside the particles of the dough so as to give it a spongy texture. This is called raising the bread.

It needs but a glance to see that it is, in its effects on the dough, purely mechanical. The dough, which was before a close-grained mass, is now full of little holes, and when cooked in this condition is what we ordinarily call light. This porous quality of bread enables the stomach to rapidly and easily digest it, for the gastric juices quickly soak into and attack it from all sides. The fermentation of the dough, however, uses up a portion of the nutrient elements of the loaf. If it be possible, therefore, to produce a light porous loaf without this destruction and without the "kneading" which is necessary to produce it, it would be a great advance.

He had been known as the firm and unshakable friend of the president of the United States, and in all his campaign speeches in Missouri he declared Mr. Cleveland to be a bimetalist in reference to the ratio.

He undertook to say, with the greatest respect for the president and without the slightest doubt of his honesty of purpose, that when he failed in that great state paper to say one word in respect to bimetalism, he certainly meant that a declaration of the question of the free coinage of silver was so impracticable that it did not need executive notice. As to the assertion that silver should be devalued, because it fluctuated in value, while gold was stable, he read an extract from what he called "a remarkable pamphlet," written by Mr. Montell Douglas, a business man of London, before the closing of the Indian market, pleading with the people of Great Britain in favor of bimetalism as the only sure foundation for financial existence, and declaring that silver has really fluctuated much less than gold.

In reply to questions by Mr. Gray, of Delaware, Mr. Vest asserted that any discussion on the subject would be imperfect and unsatisfactory which did not admit, on both sides, that the volume of the money was increased, and that the price of commodities was decreased. The price of commodities was decreased, and the price of money was increased.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

Mr. Vest spoke of the bimetalism of the French people, who, he said, were financially in a better position than the French people in existence. The French people were financially in a better position than the French people in existence.

## SOME SANITARY ASPECTS OF BREAD MAKING.

BY CYRUS EDWARDS, M. D., Health Commissioner, New York City.

It is necessary, if one would understand the sanitary aspects of bread making, to fully comprehend the present theory held by scientists of germs and the part played by them in disease. The theory of disease germs is merely the name given to the knowledge had of germs by medical men. The germ theory is the result of the long process of raising and kneading so no bread save that raised with yeast has so good a chance of gathering germs.

What a moment "raising" bread is worth a few words. The introduction of the yeast into the moist dough, the addition of heat when the pan is placed near the fire produces an enormous growth of the yeast fungi—the "germs" in other words. These fungi effect a destructive fermentation of a portion of the starchy matter of the flour—one of the most valuable nutrient elements in the flour. The fermentation produces carbonic acid gas, and this, having its origin in every little particle of the starch, pushes aside the particles of the dough so as to give it a spongy texture. This is called raising the bread.

It needs but a glance to see that it is, in its effects on the dough, purely mechanical. The dough, which was before a close-grained mass, is now full of little holes, and when cooked in this condition is what we ordinarily call light. This porous quality of bread enables the stomach to rapidly and easily digest it, for the gastric juices quickly soak into and attack it from all sides. The fermentation of the dough, however, uses up a portion of the nutrient elements of the loaf. If it be possible, therefore, to produce a light porous loaf without this destruction and without the "kneading" which is necessary to produce it, it would be a great advance.

He had been known as the firm and unshakable friend of the president of the United States, and in all his campaign speeches in Missouri he declared Mr. Cleveland to be a bimetalist in reference to the ratio.

He undertook to say, with the greatest respect for the president and without the slightest doubt of his honesty of purpose, that when he failed in that great state paper to say one word in respect to bimetalism, he certainly meant that a declaration of the question of the free coinage of silver was so impracticable that it did not need executive notice. As to the assertion that silver should be devalued, because it fluctuated in value, while gold was stable, he read an extract from what he called "a remarkable pamphlet," written by Mr. Montell Douglas, a business man of London, before the closing of the Indian market, pleading with the people of Great Britain in favor of bimetalism as the only sure foundation for financial existence, and declaring that silver has really fluctuated much less than gold.

In reply to questions by Mr. Gray, of Delaware, Mr. Vest asserted that any discussion on the subject would be imperfect and unsatisfactory